

**AMENDED DRAFT**



**APPROVED 10-23-2003**

**SCOTTSDALE DEVELOPMENT REVIEW BOARD  
KIVA - CITY HALL  
3939 N. DRINKWATER BOULEVARD  
SEPTEMBER 18, 2003  
MINUTES**

**PRESENT:** Robert Littlefield, Council Member  
E.L. Cortez, Vice Chairman  
David Barnett, Planning Commission Member  
Michael D'Andrea, Design Member  
Anne Gale, Design Member  
Jeremy Jones, Design Member  
Michael Schmitt, Design Member

**STAFF:** Suzanne Colver  
Tim Curtis  
Jayna Shewak  
Kira Wauwie  
Greg Williams

**CALL TO ORDER**

The regular meeting of the Scottsdale Development Review Board was called to order by Councilman Littlefield at 1:00 p.m.

**ROLL CALL**

A formal roll call confirmed members present as stated above.

**MINUTES APPROVAL**

August 27, 2003 DRB & PC Special Study Session Minutes  
September 4, 2003 DRB Minutes

**APPROVED 10-23-2003 - bdf**

**MR. BARNETT MADE A MOTION TO APPROVE THE AUGUST 27, 2003 JOINT MEETING MINUTES AS PRESENTED. SECOND BY MR. SCHMITT.**

**THE MOTION PASSED BY A VOTE OF SEVEN (7) TO ZERO (0).**

**VICE CHAIRMAN CORTEZ MADE A MOTION TO APPROVE THE SEPTEMBER 4, 2003 MINUTES AS PRESENTED. SECOND BY MR. SCHMITT.**

**THE MOTION PASSED BY A VOTE OF SEVEN (7) TO ZERO (0).**

**CONSENT AGENDA**

14-PP-2001#2

Mirabel Village 3  
Preliminary Plat (Revised)  
Lone Mountain Pkwy, south of Santa Fe Trail  
Vita, Architect/Designer

**COUNCILMAN LITTLEFIELD** stated there are three public comment cards on case 14-PP-2001#2.

(COUNCILMAN LITTLEFIELD OPENED PUBLIC TESTIMONY.)

**PAUL SWANSON**, stated he lives at the Rancho Santa Fe Del Oro subdivision to north of the proposed Mirabel Village 3, his lot is number 4. He further stated he is in favor of the proposed new development with the proposed modification that Mirabel is moving the building sites closer to the roadway which should allow him to look over the homes rather than through the homes. He further stated he felt they should have a 24-foot height restriction. He remarked he likes the new proposal but would like to see a uniform height restriction of 24 feet.

**JIM PALUCH**, stated he is Paul Swanson's neighbor and his lot is number 5 in Rancho Santa Fe Del Oro subdivision. He further stated Mr. Swanson brought up all of his concerns. He remarked he would like to go on record that he believed it was in everyone's best interest to go with the newer plan for the obvious reasons stated before.

**JEFF PRITCHARD**, stated he lives on the other side of Mr. Swanson in Lot number 3. He further stated he is not in favor of the new layout. The new plan has taken the same alignment and is going across three home sites instead of none. He further remarked they bought their house with the idea that they would have a view to the south and east and the way it is being reconfigured they felt they would lose a big chunk of that and that is their opposition to the proposed plan.

(COUNCILMAN LITTLEFIELD CLOSED PUBLIC TESTIMONY.)

**APPROVED 10-23-2003**

57-DR-2003

Offices of Thomas and Hayden  
Site plan and elevations  
8111 E. Thomas Rd  
Cawley Architects Inc.  
Architect/Designer

**COUNCILMAN LITTLEFIELD** inquired if any of the Board members' wanted a presentation on either of the consent agenda cases? The consensus of the Board was that presentations were not needed.

**MR. JONES MOVED TO APPROVE THE CONSENT AGENDA. SECOND BY MR. BARNETT.**

**THE MOTION PASSED BY A VOTE OF SEVEN (7) TO ZERO (0).**

**REGULAR AGENDA**

56-DR-2003

Pima Commerce Center  
Site plan and elevations  
14296, 14275 & 14287 N. 87<sup>th</sup> Street  
Patrick Hayes Architecture,  
Architect/Designer

**MS. COLVER** presented this case as per the project coordination packet. Staff recommends approval, subject to the attached stipulations.

**MR. SCHMITT** stated in the staff report it indicates the key issue is the use of reflective glass. He further stated he would consider that an issue if this building were out more in a desert location further out toward the mountains, but he does not have an issue with it along side a freeway. He inquired about staff's basis for that position. Ms. Colver stated staff has looked at the context of this particular project and they believe this architecture does fit with what is being currently approved and built out in this location.

Mr. Schmitt stated he would like to commend the design team on this building because it is nicely done and nicely articulated.

**VICE CHAIRMAN CORTEZ MOVED TO APPROVE CASE 56-DR-2003 WITH THE ATTACHED STIPULATIONS. SECOND BY MR. BARNETT.**

**THE MOTION PASSED BY A VOTE OF SEVEN (7) TO ZERO (0).**

58-DR-2003

Bill Heard Chevrolet  
8705 E. McDowell Road

**APPROVED 10-23-2003 - bdf**

Site Plan & Elevations  
Stanec Consulting, Engineers

**MR. CURTIS** presented this case as per the project coordination packet. Staff recommends approval, subject to the attached stipulations.

**LOU JEKEL**, Jekel & Howard, 8283 N. Hayden Road Suite 100, provided the history of this site and the existing facility. He stated this application is for the property located on the southwest corner of Pima Road and McDowell Road. The property owner intends to build a new Bill Heard Chevrolet dealership for the display and sale of new and used vehicles. He reported they have support from the neighbors for this project who felt this is a good step in revitalizing the McDowell corridor.

**BOB MOORE**, Fred Goree Architects, reviewed the site plan. He provided an overview of the landscaping that would be incorporated on the site. He also provided a synopsis of the floor plan. He reported all of the neighbors have seen the drawings and site line studies and they are very happy with the fact there will be a low to no silhouette of the top of the garage. He further reported they have committed to working with the neighbors regarding the specific look of the back side of the garage. The intent is to let the garage be very minimal and be a back drop to the showrooms. He concluded they are trying to have the dealership add a nice visual look for this corner.

**MR. BARNETT** stated with regard to the two houses that are right up against the back wall, he would like to see the applicant block those two house as best as possible with taller trees. Mr. Moore stated the landscape plan does show in that area the trees are a little more predominant. He further stated they are also committed to tearing down and rebuilding the existing wall.

**MR. JONES** stated when he first received the packet, he thought the building was just another dull ordinary car dealership. Then he received a letter from Mr. Jekel that told them the style was greatly dictated by the factory in Detroit for the Chevrolet work but that there have been some Scottsdale touches added after months and months of work. He reported this is extremely ordinary and nothing looks like Scottsdale. He inquired what about this should appeal to them and make them feel like it is a Scottsdale image. Mr. Moore stated they toured the city so they could get a feel of what is Scottsdale. He further stated they have added some colors, made modifications to their columns.

Mr. Jones commented he did not think the elevations were drawn correctly. He asked a series of questions to provide clarity on the elevations. Mr. Moore provided clarity on the elevations.

Mr. Jones stated the importance of adding mature trees and a lot of them along the parking garage wall.

**MR. SCHMITT** stated he would concur with Mr. Jones impression of the architecture. He further stated he would like to address the issue of sensitivity to the neighbors noting the applicant indicated they have neighborhood support. He commented that when he reviewed the packet he had anticipated a room full of people wishing to speak about the parking garage in their backyard. He further commented this Board is asked to look at a lot of projects and, the Board asks that the building has four sides and all four sides are articulated. This is just a long blank wall. He noted he has not seen any effort to try and articulate that wall.

Mr. Schmitt commented on the line of site noting the neighbors would be seeing a significant amount of the parking garage. He further commented in the area where the line of trees is being planted is down in a basin that is three feet lower than the adjacent grade so the effective height of the trees would be lower. He concluded he would have trouble supporting this project as presented because he is not convinced it is sensitive to the neighborhood.

**MR. MOORE** stated they have made a commitment to work with the neighbors and they have yet to review the full wall design with the neighborhood. He further stated that if they put mature trees in they would ultimately obscure the wall they have designed.

**COUNCILMAN LITTLEFIELD** inquired what could be done to make the wall more interesting. Mr. Moore stated there have been some discussions to have impressions put on the wall and use color but they have not had clear direction from the neighbors.

Councilman Littlefield inquired if the plan were approved their intention would be to let the neighbors decide what they want for the wall design. Mr. Moore replied in the affirmative.

**MR. JONES** related some ideas regarding how a few others walls have been handled. Since they are using tilt up they are not at all obligated to go with a horizontal line they could divide it anyway they want. The mass of the wall could be broken up in a non-regular manner. He noted there are ways to achieve this that are not too expensive just by using colors and abstract patterns.

Mr. Jones stated the main entry feature on the front door looks like one of the detection devices at the airport. Mr. Moore stated the intent was to reinforce the entry. He further stated right now it is a painted steel tube and is very minimal. It is not meant to detract from the overall but to mark the entry from a distance.

**MR. SCHMITT** stated a wall that long needs something to break up the length. Maybe they could offset it in a few places and do something to break up the long surface. He further stated he would like to see it brought back to the Board so they would know what it would look like.

Mr. Schmitt inquired where the ventilation for the enclosed garages would occur. Mr. Moore stated the ventilation system would be on the ground level in an enclosed room with soundproofing.

**MR. D'ANDREA** inquired if there would be any lighting standards on the top level of the parking garage. Mr. Moore replied in the negative. He stated they would only have low lighting that would be built into the perimeter. The lighting would be very low-level lighting.

**VICE CHAIRMAN CORTEZ** requested clarification regarding how the exterior walls will be painted. Mr. Moore stated the intent is to give a darker color at the top with a rust colored band and a lighter lower portion to tie it together.

Vice Chairman Cortez stated he would concur with his fellow Board members comments on the parking garage south elevations. He further stated the fact there has been no neighborhood outreach with regard to that elevation is indicative of that fact that there are no neighbors here today. He remarked based on the fact that there has not been neighborhood outreach on the south elevations, he would be reluctant to support the case as presented today.

Vice Chairman Cortez stated that regarding the landscaping on Willetta Street they indicated a new site wall would be constructed. He inquired if the owner would provide landscaping to the south of that wall and if so who would maintain it. Mr. Jekel stated they have offered to landscape that when the new wall is built but they would expect the Homeowners Association would maintain it. He remarked in terms of the neighborhood input they have had many, many meetings and they have received some suggestions but they did not have a consensus from the neighborhood so when it comes time to start drawing the plans they will have another meeting with the neighbors. He reported they will keep working with the neighborhood. Vice Chairman Cortez stated he would applaud their efforts working with the neighborhood and he would like to see them continue to work with them regarding the south wall.

**COUNCILMAN LITTLEFIELD** stated he would be in favor of moving this forward today. He further stated he felt there was incentive for the applicant to meet with the neighbors regarding the wall issue. He added he would support this request.

**MR. JONES** stated he would prefer the final design be brought back to the Board for review whether that means continuing or approving it pending further design of the exterior. He suggested re-evaluation of all colors and patterns. Softening

of the color and shape of the face of the canopy. A more Scottsdale development of the entry. He noted he felt all of the problems were solvable but he would like to ensure they get another look of the final design.

**MR. BARNETT MOVED TO APPROVE CASE 58-DR-2003 WITH THE FOLLOWING STIPULATION:**

**THE APPLICANT SHALL BRING BACK REAR WALL DESIGN FOR BOTH THE PARKING GARAGE AND REAR WALL AS WELL AS THE LANDSCAPING PLANS. FURTHER CONSIDERATION TO THE STYLE COLORS AND FACING OF THE BUILDING.**

**SECOND BY MR. JONES.**

**THE MOTION PASSED BY A VOTE OF SIX (6) TO ONE (1), COMMISSIONER SCHMITT DISSENTING.**

**ADJOURNMENT**

With no further business to discuss, the regular meeting of the Scottsdale Development Review Board was adjourned at 2:05 p.m.

Respectfully Submitted

"For the Record" Court Reporters